

1961 and 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.

# PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 8797. A bill for the relief of Augustus Silvera Gordon also known as Franklin Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8798. A bill for the relief of Romeo Gasparini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8799. A bill for the relief of Col. Alfred P. Kitson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 8800. A bill for the relief of Kiriaki Papapaschaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8801. A bill for the relief of the Maco Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 8802. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas Kolakowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8803. A bill for the relief of Nimia R. Concepcion, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8804. A bill for the relief of Salvadora Galope Batol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andja Mirich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8806. A bill for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8807. A bill for the relief of Theodoros Spiros Psitos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 8808. A bill for the relief of Dr. Irfan A. Orer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Con. Res. 415. Concurrent resolution honoring the memory of Mrs. Elsie Winters Mitchell, who was killed in Oregon by the explosion of a Japanese balloon bomb during World War II, and expressing congressional recognition of her heroism in attempting to prevent the death of five children in such explosion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

261. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Alameda, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that every effort be expended in behalf of legislation which will continue the financing of the Federal interstate highway program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### DAV Services in Oregon

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Oregon citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Oregon, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is Bill H. Tribble, of Crestline, Kans. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations.

Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The two DAV national service officers in Oregon are Mr. Gerald S. Kelsey and Mr. James W. Hudson, located at the VA Regional Office, 208 South West Fifth Avenue, Portland, Ore. The department commander is Mr. Dan Cole, 2520 J Street, Springfield, Ore., and the department adjutant is Mr. T. F. Van Laningham, 429 South West Fourth Avenue, Portland, Ore.

The three VA hospitals in Oregon are a 1,000-bed DOM hospital at Camp White, a 567-bed GM hospital at Portland, and a 670-bed NP hospital at Roseburg. VAVS representatives: Camp White, Patrick Graham; Roseburg, Charles T. McCoy; Portland, George Youmans.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$52,414,000 for its veteran program in Oregon, including \$13,730,806 disability compensation to its 17,408 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Oregon furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 11 percent—1,859—are members of the 27 DAV chapters in Oregon.

This 11 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Oregon veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal

years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate).....	31,357
Claims folders reviewed.....	26,131
Appearances before rating boards.....	12,892
Compensation increases obtained.....	2,634
Service connections obtained.....	792
Nonservice pensions.....	828
Death benefits obtained.....	430
Total monetary benefits obtained.....	\$933,996.15

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Oregon veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement in to suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefit, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans, not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A claims and rating record board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About eight-tenths of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Oregon, with a consequent loss of about \$224,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Oregon to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of

the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identito-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identito-Tag department, 3,538 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Oregon residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans, by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established

such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Oregon by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 1707 18th Street NW., Washington 9, D.C.

Every serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV.

### Reply to the Carey Letter

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN H. RAY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the Record a copy of my reply to the form letter sent to many Members of Congress by Mr. James B. Carey last week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,  
President, IUERMW,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of August 18 regarding my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400. You do not like my vote on that bill and, of course, I take no exception to your so advising me.

I take strong exception, however, to your suggestions that I voted to punish or repress or weaken all labor unions, or that I yielded to pressure from any business organization. Those suggestions have no basis in fact.

My vote was determined by my own judgment, exercised in the light of my own conscience as to what was needed to protect the public and particularly union members and their families and small business against such abuses of power, whether by management or union officials, as have been exposed in various committee hearings. The foregoing statement has special importance in connection with the provisions in H.R. 8400 which relate to the bill of rights, organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, hot cargo, and no man's land. Enactment of H.R. 8400 will not, in my judgment, interfere with any legitimate union activity of which I have been informed.

You may be sure that I studied the effects of H.R. 8400 before I decided how to vote upon it. In that process I carefully considered the views of all who had written to



or talked with me about abuses of power by either labor officials or management, and I talked with union officials and everyone else who came in to discuss H.R. 8400. Some union members who live in my district think that H.R. 8400 does not go far enough to protect them against loss of their union cards—and that means their livelihood—without a fair hearing.

Many union members and their families live in my district and you may be sure I advised union officials who had talked with me as to how I would vote.

Members of unions in my district are good citizens. They will resent and reject, as do I, your notion that if unions are to be strong, their officials must be allowed to continue abuses of power of the kind which H.R. 8400 seeks to prevent.

Taken as a whole, your letter confirms the need for legislation such as H.R. 8400.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. RAY,  
Member of Congress.

### Inter-American Development Bank

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE,  
OF WEST VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1959.—Quite often Congress passes significant legislation which is largely if not completely ignored by the press and the public. A case in point is the Inter-American Development Bank which was recently created by Congress with a capitalization of \$1 billion.

The United States will provide \$450 million of the capital. Latin American nations will provide \$550 million and will be represented on the governing board.

The significance of the new Bank lies in the fact that it marks an entirely new departure in our economic relationship with friendly nations to the south. Economic aid, in the form of direct grants and gifts, are to be played down. Instead, our Latin neighbors will look to the new Bank for loans to provide the capital necessary for economic development.

The United States is prone to forget just how important Latin America is to this country. Trade between the two areas runs into the hundreds of millions each year. Also, it is important to our national security to make sure that Communist regimes do not gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

All of our neighbors to the south, with the possible exception of Mexico, are experiencing dangerous economic difficulties. All of them need to expand trade and to speed up industrial development. The United States cannot provide all of the capital that is needed. Even if we could, it would not be good policy to do so. The countries themselves need to feel they have a vital stake in their own development programs.

The new Bank will fill this great need. It is going to be a businesslike operation. Borrowing nations will have to come up with sound programs which bank officials can accept as having a good chance of paying off.

This is a cooperative venture. Direct grants or gifts are too one sided to be completely effective.

This shift of emphasis in our economic aid program in Latin America is significant. I hope it will point the way to a gradual elimination of the economic aid program on the present basis.

Also, this year Congress approved another far reaching international financing plan which attracted very little attention. This was the International Development Association which is to be an adjunct of the World Bank.

It is hoped this new Bank can put to useful, productive work much of the \$3 billions in foreign currency which the United States has acquired since the end of the war. It would work like this: Country X applies to the World Bank for a loan of \$50 million. The World Bank feels it cannot loan but \$30 million. The new organization would then make a secondary loan of \$20 million, almost all in foreign currency of various kinds which can be used to buy materials in all parts of the world.

The new organization should make it possible for the World Bank to greatly step up its operations. And the more the Bank can loan, the less will be the need for direct grants of money by the United States to underdeveloped nations struggling to build a sound economy.

The people are getting tired of Congress voting billions each year for gifts to foreign countries. The new loan programs offer a sound, workable alternative and they should be much more successful. It puts our economic relations on a sound, businesslike basis and should in the long run help end the annual drain on our Treasury.

### Carey Letter Is Unworthy of U.S. Labor Movement

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I received a threatening letter several days ago from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Because Mr. Carey resorted to outright intimidation, he has been justifiably criticized in the press and by many people, regardless of their views on labor reform legislation.

I am sure that, in addition, Mr. Carey received many answers to his letter from the Members of Congress he vowed reprisal against. As one such Member, I sent him my answer on August 20.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Carey's letter and my reply:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,  
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,  
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men

and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,  
President.

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,  
President, International Union of Electrical,  
Radio, and Machine Workers, Wash-  
ington, D.C.:

DEAR MR. CAREY: Throughout the day I have been rereading your threatening letter of August 18.

I can't tell you how sorry and disappointed I am to receive such a letter from a man who has been elected to a very high position in the labor movement. The letter is not only unworthy of you, but it embarrassed the great membership you are obliged to represent.

Up to now, the mail I received on labor legislation has been extremely helpful. The great majority of letters, cards, and wires were from people in the first district who favored the Landrum-Griffin bill. But I must say that the people who supported the Elliott and Shelley bills were just as kind and considerate as they could be in their letters to me.

People who are just as partisan in their opinions as you, Mr. Carey, were courteous, reasoned, and balanced in their judgments.

For example, until you wrote nobody implied that I was uninformed, stupid, or a tool of special interest groups. I was not threatened in any way until your letter arrived. The people who have disagreed with me have managed to tell me so without shaking their fists—in a spirit of the interchange of ideas, without resorting to abuse.

Since the Landrum-Griffin bill has passed, the response has been gratifying. Even folks who are still unconvinced that the Landrum-Griffin bill was the best we could do, share in a sense, the belief of the Washington Post and Times Herald which says editorially today:

"We do not think the labor movement will suffer any real loss. \* \* \* Nor will any union be killed by a reasonable compromise of the present Senate and House bills—unless it be some racket-ridden units that are a disgrace to organized labor in any event."

You did not ask me why I supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, but I believe you deserve to know why. I feel the bill provides the best means by which we can correct the abuses which exist in some areas of the country, and still remain true to the goal in not being punitive to the many unions which have been dealing fairly with their memberships.

Your letter is really unique, Mr. Carey, in that you have not given me your views on the important subject of labor legislation.

Its purpose was to convey a threat. I am not, in any way, afraid of what you pledge to do to me because I believe that such a threat, underscored as it is with anger and revenge, will get nowhere.

But, if I may, I would like to give you a word of advice. You hold a very responsible position in the labor movement, and I am sure that the many fine people you represent are looking to you for leadership. You owe it to these people to be an effective spokesman for labor. Because you wrote the letter you did, you damaged your effectiveness greatly. I believe that you owe your constituents—the rank and file electrical, radio, and machine workers—a great deal. You might begin repaying their confidence by exercising the reasoned, temperate leadership they have a right to expect.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
Member of Congress.

### A Bill To Make Civil Service Retirement Available to ASC Employees on a Voluntary Basis

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which proposes to extend to the employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees the opportunity to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act. I am joined in the introduction of this bill by the other Democratic Members of the House from Iowa, the Honorable MERWIN COAD, NEAL SMITH, and LEONARD WOLF.

All of us have, in recent weeks, received considerable mail from ASC people in our congressional districts of Iowa in which they have protested a ruling by the Iowa State ASC Committee making retirement mandatory at age 65. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the retirement age under civil service is specified at 70 years of age.

It seems to me somewhat shortsighted to force these men into retirement at age 65 when they have accumulated such a wealth of experience and when they still have several years of valuable service they could render to the program. Furthermore, such a mandatory ruling fails to take into account a man's individual capabilities and makes chronological age the only criterion of his value and effectiveness in his profession.

I want to emphasize that this bill would not force people to come under civil service retirement who do not desire to do so. This is intended to be purely a voluntary matter. The proposed piece of legislation is designed simply to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to make civil service retirement available to the persons desiring to take advantage of it.

I wish to point out that the Department of Agriculture has no policy which will prohibit a man in the ASC service from working until the age of 70 years.

I should add that my understanding of this matter is that the State committees are presently authorized to request and obtain an employee's resignation for reasons of unfitness or inability to perform his duties. Therefore, such a bill as I have proposed here would not preempt any prerogatives that the State committees now have in the area of personnel management. The purpose of the bill is simply to establish certainty as to retirement from ASC service where such certainty does not now exist. Judging from my mail, the ruling by the Iowa State Committee has had an unsettling effect on the morale of ASC employees, and it is simply my wish to restore that morale and at the same time make it possible to utilize the professional capabilities of ASC employees to the fullest extent.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8774

A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees shall be held and considered to be employees of the Government of the United States.*

*(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of such Act with respect to such employees.*

*SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of the first section of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.*

James B. Carey: Humorist

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a rereading of the letter I received last week from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, confirms my original conclusion that the man is a humorist. The very fact that Mr. Carey sets out to intimidate those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill marks him as either a man with a sense of humor or as one who is so naive that he thinks Congress will grovel in the face of his awesome threats. Of course, there is the possibility that Mr. Carey is just another arrogant labor leader who is inclined to use his muscles rather than his head but I really do not think so.

In any event I have dignified his outburst to the extent of the following reply:

AUGUST 24, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,  
President, International Union of Electrical,  
Radio & Machine Workers, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Thank you very much for your letter of August 18. I am having it reproduced for circulation among my constituents in order to acquaint them with the ill temper and bad manners of certain labor leaders, which would seem to further justify our support of the so-called Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Incidentally, I am amazed that you are so poorly informed in regards to the voting habits of the people of my district. In each campaign in which I have sought reelection the leaders of organized labor have hit me with everything in the book. That I have been victorious each time attests to the conservatism of the voters rather than to my popularity.

Again my warmest thanks for the best piece of campaign material I have ever received.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. DAGUE.

It has always been my firm conviction that the leaders of organized labor have been completely out of step with the thinking of the people in the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Public reaction, however, to such bald threats as made by Mr. Carey is, in my opinion, accurately reflected in the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., on August 21, 1959:

#### THREATS

The type of letter received yesterday by Members of the House who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill warning them that labor union members will try to throw them out of office represents the kind of thing that should not be countenanced in this country.

Representatives are chosen to represent all of the people and not the interests of simply one group of constituents. No Member of the House in recent weeks could mistake the sentiment of the people as a whole in regard to the need for curbing certain labor leaders of whom James R. Hoffa is a fair example. Because the public demanded effective labor legislation at this session of Congress, the Landrum-Griffin bill was approved by a margin of 178 votes.

Every House Member who supported that bill received a letter yesterday from James B. Carey, AFL-CIO official, warning them of what union members intend to do because they voted for what the union considers "punitive repressive" labor legislation.

Every properly registered citizen has the privilege of going to the polls at election time and voting for the candidate which he feels is best qualified for the office to be filled. Once elected, the official must be free to vote for legislation which he feels best serves the welfare of the people as a whole. He must be free to do this without fear of threats or reprisals. Otherwise, he could not possibly represent the people as he should.

It is also the privilege of every citizen to keep in touch with elected officials so that they may know how they (the people) feel in regard to current legislation. Officials welcome such contacts. But no official welcomes the kind of communication that has reached supporters of the Landrum-Griffin bill. In effect it said—because you voted for that bill, we're out to get you.



One Representative termed the letter "bitter and ill tempered," and in a reply wrote: "Please do not insult me by threats." That probably pretty well summed up the feelings of the 229 House Members who were the targets of Carey's letter.

The Honorable PAUL B. DAGUE, who represents Chester and Lancaster Counties in the House, told the local News last night when he feels that he must bow to corruption in the ranks of union labor then his effectiveness as a Member of the House is over. Representative DAGUE supported the Landrum-Griffin bill on the first vote when it squeezed through with only 28 votes to spare. He was also in the "aye" column on the final vote. His stand in regard to the kind of labor legislation needed to deal with corruption is thus a matter of record.

James B. Carey also sent letters to 201 other House Members who saw fit to vote against the bill, pledging them his support. That is his privilege. But letters which breathe of intimidation and mailed to representatives who voted in the interests of the national welfare, have no part in a Nation which believes in a free and representative government.

### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of August 22, 1959:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 22, 1959.

The first session of the 86th Congress is struggling to a close, many Members think, although in the next breath some concede the possibility of endless debate ahead. Here's a roundup.

Controversial issues to be carried over include minimum wage, aid to education, aid to depressed areas, Federal unemployment compensation, Federal health insurance, social security expansion, interest rate ceiling removal (and others?).

Controversial issues considered earlier and scheduled for further action include labor reform, housing, and the farm program. New items for House debate include Public Law 480, (surplus food disposal), civil rights, highways and gasoline tax increase, and foreign investment tax incentive (H.R. 5).

Controversial clashes of viewpoint continue and include the political front, for example, who's for big spending, and the balanced budget; our international policy embodied in foreign aid (including food surplus disposal) and the Khrushchev visit.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, to dispose of surplus commodities, with amendments, was the week's big floor debate, centered around a barter provision. The big question—should the United States dispose of our surplus food products in exchange for strategic materials for our national stockpile rather than sell for foreign currency, which currency may or may not be of any use to the United States. If not, then the food in effect becomes a gift. The complicated, confusing, and at times self-defeating nature of this program led

me to observe in debate that the problems confronting us arise because of a very basic problem, quite overlooked; namely, that the Federal Government is not set up nor intended constitutionally to be in the distribution of food, clothing or other necessities, neither at home nor abroad. The original emergency nature of disposal of farm surpluses has now, in my view, been distorted so that surpluses are encouraged, Government regulation fostered, and the free market destroyed in the United States and throughout the world. The fact is, our surpluses endanger the economies of other nations, too. This basic fault of the program itself was not debated. Government has been accepted as a food distributor at the taxpayers' expense. All I can hope to do is to keep the criticism alive, until the people demand an accounting. This I have done and shall so continue.

Civil rights, already through the Senate, will probably be before the House soon. The Democrat leadership is committed to advance in this field. The questions to be resolved: (1) A tough bill or a relatively innocuous one? (2) This year, or next (election) year? Odds are, in my opinion, an innocuous bill this year, because: (1) Few can show any real need (other than political in some districts) for further legislation; and (2) many Republicans may feel constrained to cooperate with those Southern Democrats who helped in enacting a legitimate labor reform act. I expect a bill to extend the Civil Rights Commission and give the Justice Department a little greater authority to investigate local election practices. The gasoline tax increase may take time, now that the Ways and Means Committee has voted out a 1-cent increase for 22 months and a later 5-percent excise tax allocation to highways. I am among those opposing a tax increase. (See newsletters of July 25 and August 1). Highways can be built without more tax, I believe.

Earlier controversial issues yet to be resolved are headed by labor reform, which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Housing could continue as a tremendous struggle in view of the veto, the Senate's attempt to override (both Texas Senators so voted), and the legitimate needs embodied in the earlier outrageous bill, that require that a bill be passed. The present suggested compromise is only a lesser degree of the faults of the vetoed bill, including more public housing direct loans for college classrooms (back door Treasury financing beyond Congress' control), urban renewal (though reduced), and others. As before, this bill probably will be held until the last minute and then railroaded through. As for agriculture, the general recommendations of the President for reduced price-support levels and eased acreage requirements will get little if any attention, I believe, even though the President may urgently so request of Congress.

The interest rate ceiling's removal (see newsletters of June 13, 27, and July 11) so urgently requested by Treasury Secretary Anderson to reduce the cost of Government financing has become a political football. By a party line vote (Democrats for, Republicans against), the Committee on Ways and Means voted to shelve such needed action until next year. The Government thus is forced to continue to compete with families and small business men for the available money in the short-term loan market. As I see it, it is wrong for Congress after spending the money to tie the hands of the Secretary in financing the Government debt.

So Congress struggles on, not all good, not all bad, but just like people. Congress will improve only as the people force improvement by demanding right action. Adjournment date is anyone's guess.

### Prelude to Annual Report by Congresswoman Edna F. Kelly

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, every year it has been my practice to submit a report to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District in New York on important legislation enacted during the session of Congress. In my report, which of necessity is brief, I try to be factual on key legislation enacted. The report this year will only cover the first session of the 86th Congress and should be sent out shortly after the adjournment of Congress. It is, of course, impossible to predict with accuracy when Congress will adjourn and, more important, what specific legislative measures will be enacted into law. At this point I have, therefore, decided in a preliminary statement to describe to the people of my district the difficult and complicated atmosphere hovering over this session. This, then, is the prelude to my report.

The first session of the 86th Congress convened and will adjourn with war clouds engulfing the entire world. The density of the clouds fluctuated with the actions of the leaders of the Kremlin. As heavy and ominous as the clouds were with the appearance of the sputnik and lunik, they increased with the overt, aggressive actions of the "comrades" in the Middle East, the Far East, Tibet, Latin America, Central America, including Cuba, in Europe again with the Berlin impasse and once more in southeastern Asia, Laos.

A diminishing of the war clouds followed appeasement of the comrades in the Ministers' meeting, a pending but never accomplished summit meeting, and finally plans for an exchange of heads of state.

Thus, it can be said with no exaggeration that Congress met and will adjourn in one of the most trying times in the history of the United States.

The international outlook for the Democratic-controlled Congress was not made felicitous by the Republican-controlled executive branch of the Government. Congress convened labeled by President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the Republican Party, as being controlled by "political radicals, spend-thrifts, and gloom-dogglers."

Bear in mind that when Congress convened, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, promised "a sensible posture of defense against the growing might of the Soviet Union," and in the next breath he warned we must "guard against feverish building up of vast armaments." The observing public saw Congress placed publicly between the horns of the dilemma.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placat-

ing the administration in its request for the highest budget in "peacetime," of grappling with a \$9 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Republican administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Democratic legislators was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little. Most of the bills passed to date have been cut below the President's recommendations.

A most astounding turnabout has been the long negotiations for exchange visits of Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. The same man who recently lamented the apathy of Americans in the face of the Soviet menace has invited the head of the Soviet regime to be a guest of the United States. This appears to many to be a colossal swallowing of principle, a betrayal of our civilization, a quashing of the loyalty we owe to American youths who perished at the hands of Soviet treachery, and a gross insult to the millions of once free men enslaved by that dictatorship.

Adherence to the absolute moral principles upon which our country was founded should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to the dedicated enemy of free men and free institutions.

This action, preceded by the humiliation inflicted upon the Western representatives at Geneva, makes it more difficult to understand. President Eisenhower predicated a summit meeting on progress made at Geneva. What progress? The West did not bring up the question of the captive nations. East German observers were given equal status with the observers of West Germany which conferred de facto recognition of East Germany. What happened to the demand that the Berlin and Germany problems be considered as one? The West capitulated and conceded them as separate issues. What happened to the challenge of the blockade of Berlin? This has been shelved. The United States now speaks of "rights of access" after proving that the West had rights of occupation since 1945. Now we are practically conceding that the Soviet has rights to terminate this agreement.

The intended visit of the Soviet Premier is repugnant to me because no credence can be placed upon the word of a Mikoyan, a Kozlov, or a Khrushchev. The gain, if any, does not outweigh the loss of trust by our allies, the creation of more apathy and misinterpretation by Americans, causing a quasi-insecurity among free people everywhere, and the propaganda use this visit will be made of in Moscow and other capitals inimical to the U.S.S.R. All of this created confusion in Congress

on legislation without positive leadership from the executive branch.

The reversal of policy and the confused and confusing pattern of weak executive leadership has, in effect, pulled the rug from under the Congress. Despite this background, I predict that the record of the 86th Congress, 1st session, will make history on the positive side of the ledger, thanks to a strong and dynamic democratic leadership.

### Itinerary of Annual Official Tour of the Fourth District of Indiana

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. E. ROSS ADAIR**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I am preparing for my annual official tour of the Fourth District of Indiana, to meet with the constituents I am privileged to represent.

This year I am planning to visit a number of the post offices in the district and will be available for conferences and interviews at each of these places. I believe this will be convenient for persons who desire to discuss legislative or governmental matters with me.

These official tours of the district are always most helpful. They afford a firsthand opportunity of obtaining views of constituents on the most important legislative issues of the day and at the same time of furthering the understanding between the people and their Representative in Congress.

Upon the completion of the tour, I will then have my district office—room 925, Lincoln Tower, Fort Wayne—open to carry on my official duties while I am home between sessions of the Congress. Meanwhile, my office here—room 1511, House Office Building—will be open as usual for the conduct of official business.

I cordially invite my friends and constituents to call upon me for whatever service or assistance I can render with respect to their problems relative to legislative or governmental matters, either while I am on the tour or in my office.

The itinerary of my official tour is as follows:

October 14, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Ossian.

October 14, 11 a.m.: Post office, Bluffton.

October 14, 2 p.m.: Post office, Decatur.

October 14, 4 p.m.: Post office, Berne.

October 15, 10 a.m.: Post office, Garrett.

October 15, 11:30 a.m.: Post office, Auburn.

October 15, 2:30 p.m.: Post office, Butler.

October 15, 4:30 p.m.: Post office, Waterloo.

October 20, 10 a.m.: Post office, Angola.

October 20, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Fremont.

October 20, 4 p.m.: Post office, LaGrange.

October 21, 10 a.m.: Post office, Albion.

October 21, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Kendallville.

October 21, 4 p.m.: Post office, Ligonier.

October 22, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Columbia City.

October 22, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, South Whitley.

October 22, 4 p.m.: Post office, Churubusco.

### Food Donations Set Record

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ALBERT H. QUIE**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the record set by the administration in donating nearly 3 billion pounds of surplus foods during fiscal year 1959 is surely a record of which all Americans can be proud.

It has been announced recently that this food has been provided for use in our own school-lunch programs and charitable institutions as well as to needy persons at home and abroad. The distribution shows an increase of 5 percent over the previous fiscal year, and marks a high point in donations of Government-owned foods.

The increase has been distributed to domestic outlets, as donations to needy persons, schools, and institutions total more than a billion pounds for the year—a considerable rise over the 871,600,000 pounds distributed the previous year and a tremendous increase from the figure of 161,100,000 pounds in 1953.

Foreign distribution amounted to 1,867,200,000 pounds in donations in fiscal 1959, compared to the 24 million pounds donated in 1953. The administration reports that increased donations of wheat flour were offset by decreased amounts of cheese which was removed from the list of foreign donations last year.

I believe the administration deserves unsparing praise for the manner in which it is handling this important feature of our surplus disposal program. Foods acquired through surplus removal and price support programs are distributed to eligible recipients in our country through designated agencies of State and local governments—while distribution in 91 countries has been handled by voluntary church and welfare organizations. It is important to note that surplus foods are donated for relief overseas only after they have been made available to meet needs in our own country.

Because I believe it is important for all of us to see where the food is going in our own country, I am including a table which sets forth the numbers of



needy persons in family units who received donated commodities in June 1959:

Alabama.....	127, 127
Arizona.....	50, 423
Arkansas.....	178, 341
California.....	23, 215
Colorado.....	18, 799
Connecticut.....	587
Delaware.....	3, 062
District of Columbia.....	29, 604
Georgia.....	30, 878
Illinois.....	79, 281
Indiana.....	75, 485
Iowa.....	65, 919
Kansas.....	11, 370
Kentucky.....	280, 968
Louisiana.....	120, 604
Maine.....	56, 543
Maryland.....	44, 532
Massachusetts.....	4, 114
Michigan.....	380, 343
Minnesota.....	33, 314
Mississippi.....	179, 055
Missouri.....	93, 153
Montana.....	8, 877
Nevada.....	992
New Hampshire.....	6, 703
New Jersey.....	13, 789
New Mexico.....	35, 628
New York.....	364, 056
North Dakota.....	5, 320
Ohio.....	113, 568
Oklahoma.....	232, 186
Pennsylvania.....	735, 368
Puerto Rico.....	595, 430
Rhode Island.....	11, 432
South Dakota.....	23, 994
Tennessee.....	149, 458
Texas.....	118, 138
Utah.....	11, 667
Vermont.....	11, 633
Virginia.....	37, 404
Washington.....	3, 977
West Virginia.....	295, 345
Wisconsin.....	40, 076
Wyoming.....	7, 468
Trust territory.....	3, 218
Samoa (American).....	2, 905
Total.....	4, 715, 349

Mr. Speaker, the total figure of 4,715,349 should be compared to the 100,000 needy persons in family units who received donated food in fiscal 1953. This is truly a great demonstration of the worth and success of this vital program.

## Review of Record of 1st Session of 86th Congress

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the weekend, I was pleased to comment over Wisconsin radio stations on the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Naturally, it is possible in a broadcast to touch only the highlights of the manifold, complex legislative actions in Congress.

Generally, however, I feel that—when Congress winds up—the record of accomplishments will be moderately good,

particularly in two major fields of which have been required bipartisan cooperation:

First, keeping the peace; and  
Second, successfully recovering from our economic setback.

I was privileged, also, to review the tasks still ahead of us upon which constructive action is needed prior to adjournment.

And finally, the broadcast covers problems that—as we all recognize will remain unresolved in a number of fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS KEEPING PEACE AND RECOVERING FROM RECESSION ARE TWO MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NATION—EVALUATES RECORD OF 86TH CONGRESS MODERATELY GOOD

(Address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations.)

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to be with you.

As you know, the adjournment of Congress is not far away.

In reviewing our progress in Congress, and as a nation, it is important to take a look at the record.

Insofar as it reflects bipartisan accomplishments, I believe the record is moderately good.

With adjournment there will, of course, be efforts—often “colored” in a partisan manner—to evaluate its record by either attempting to take credit for the accomplishments, or, conversely attempting to blame the other party for failures.

Without engaging in such partisanship, however, I would like to review the record briefly, including achievements we have made as a nation.

Question. Senator WILEY, what are the major marks of progress?

Answer. Although there have been advancements in a great many fields, I believe that two major accomplishments stand above the rest in the record. These include: keeping the peace; and successfully recovering from the economic recession.

#### PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

First of all, we have supported policies and programs that have helped to keep the peace; for the most part, this means preventing the cold war from degenerating into a hot war.

By and large, our foreign policy has had bipartisan support. Naturally, honest men may differ on national policy.

Overall, however, I believe the Nation can be gratified that the majority of its leaders—both Republican and Democrat—have been big enough to rise above lesser considerations and work for what is best for the country.

We are aware, of course, that keeping the peace and promoting greater security is not something that can be achieved—then forgotten. Rather, this is a continuous task.

Although there has been a superficial “thaw” in the East-West relations, we must remain alert and keep our powder dry.

Around the globe, the Communists are continuing their efforts at penetration of more areas and seeking control of more people.

Consequently, we must not be deceived by the words of peace of Khrushchev or any other Communist; rather, it will be necessary to keep up our guard—until words of peace are backed up with actual deeds.

Among the steps that Congress still must take is the approval of an adequate mutual

security program—to further strengthen the alliance of free nations.

#### UNITED STATES MAKES ECONOMIC COMEBACK

Question. What is the second major accomplishment, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I believe the fact that we have successfully recovered from the economic recession is a real victory for the country.

Contrary to predictions of the prophets of gloom and doom, the Nation—despite an economic setback—did not succumb to a major depression. Instead, the Congress, administration leadership, and, most important, the confident outlook of Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, demonstrated the spirit and zeal necessary to prevent what might have been a serious depression, with ultimately disastrous international results.

Again, it is gratifying to acknowledge that—though there were differences of views at times—the leadership of both parties again rose to the challenge.

Now, it is true—that, economically speaking, inflation still plagues us—the cost of living is high—and there are still a number of unemployed. However, there also is a number of factors that brighten the outlook.

Question. What are these, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Today, the Nation is experiencing new highs in the economic field. These include the gross national product—that is, the value of all goods and services—amounts to about \$485 billion; and national income is at a record high of \$374 billion; civilian employment is at a peak of over 67 million.

In Wisconsin, too, the outlook is brightening.

According to a recent survey, the State hit record high levels in a great many facets of the economy.

Employment has hit a high level of 1,582,300—although this still leaves about 2.5 percent of the labor force unemployed (as compared, however, to 5.4 percent this time last year).

Average weekly earnings for production workers in our manufacturing industries are earning an average of \$94.57 weekly—an increase of 7.1 percent over last June.

The trend in homebuilding is up over last year;

Sales of cars and trucks are well above comparable 1958 levels;

Department stores sales gained 12 percent in the 5-month period beginning in January;

Business and corporations have set a new record—up nearly 50 percent over last year.

We recognize, of course, that we still have economic problems—including the need for action to reach an early settlement of the steel strike. Based on the record, however, I believe we can continue to deal with these successfully.

There has, of course, been real progress, also, in a great many other fields.

Question. Senator WILEY, we appreciate a quick look at the record of major accomplishments. Now, looking ahead, what are the jobs that must still be completed by the 86th Congress prior to the adjournment of its 1st session?

JOB STILL TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY 86TH CONGRESS

Answer. There are, of course, a number of major tasks ahead of us. These include:

Providing financing for the highway program;

Enacting an effective labor reform law;

Strengthening our civil rights status;

Enactment of a good housing program;

Approval of funds to strengthen our mutual security alliance.

In addition, there are a substantial number of other bills still pending on the calendars in both the Senate and House of Representatives that deserve the consideration of Congress.

# WHAT CONGRESS—OR THE COUNTRY—FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH

Question. Are there any fields in which it looks like Congress—and the country—still must face serious challenges in the future?

Answer. Yes. Unfortunately, solutions have not yet been found for a number of problems. These include:

First, the farm problem. Despite high costs, the economic outlook for the American farmer has not been substantially improved, nor have surpluses been reduced;

Second, we need tax reform, along the lines recommended in the Wiley bill, S. 1885, to establish a Hoover-type Tax Commission to make an overhaul of the overall tax system.

Third, the economy has not succeeded in mustering forces to block inflation. Regrettably, this economic hazard is still reducing the buying power of dollars, diminishing value of savings, investments in bonds, and life insurance; making it extremely difficult for folks on modest retirement incomes to meet the high costs of living and otherwise plaguing the economy.

Unfortunately, this general but brief review does not provide an opportunity to touch upon activities in a great many other important fields. These include: conservation, veterans' programs, education, programs for the aging, brightening the outlook for youth, and a great many others.

## COMPLETION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Prior to closing, I would like to mention one more significant major mark of progress; that is, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Dedicated in June of this year, there has been a tremendous increase in the first-season traffic through the improved, deepened, and modernized waterway.

As a sponsor of the seaway law, I am particularly happy that the completed project promises fulfillment of the great expectations which we envisioned in enacting legislation for U.S. work on the St. Lawrence project.

## STOPPING THE "CHICAGO WATER STEAL"

Question. Senator WILEY, now turning to a closely related subject, we recall that the bill, H.R. 1, proposing to divert more water from Lake Michigan, was favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee this week.

Answer. Yes; unfortunately, the measure is now before the Senate. As things look now, it may come up for consideration next week.

Question. What is your strategy, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Naturally, I shall fight the bill. Among other things, I shall attempt to have the measure recommitted to committee; this time to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs.

Question. Why do you say that, Senator?

Answer. In the U.S. Senate, legislation affecting our relations with other countries, and relating to treaties with other nations, should be handled by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The dangerous water diversion bill touches upon both these criteria in these areas of activity.

First, it threatens to jeopardize our relations with our good neighbor, Canada, by diverting waters of the Great Lakes in which Canada has a vital interest; and secondly, the unilateral action to divert dangerously large volumes of water threatens to violate our treaty with Canada relating to the utilization of common waters between the two countries.

Time after time, the Canadian Government has resoundingly voiced its strong opposition—and wisely, I believe—to the proposed water steal legislation.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, ought not to let go unnoticed the voice of a friendly government in such a critical matter.

There are, of course, sufficient reasons at home why the bill should not be enacted. If this is done, it will seriously jeopardize safe shipping, reduced tonnage carried on the lakes, damage lakeshore property, and impair dock facilities and port and harbor development projects. In addition, it would endanger the St. Lawrence Seaway and threaten to damage beaches and resorts.

## CONCLUSION

Question. Thank you, Senator WILEY, for this preadjournment review of the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Answer. I have been happy, once again, to have the opportunity to discuss with you a variety of programs, issues, and challenges.

Now, this is your senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, saying "Thanks for listening."

## Health Coverage Needed for Retired Career Federal Civilian Employees

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide voluntary health benefits coverage for retired career civilian employees of the Government. I do so in recognition of my responsibility as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

My bill is a companion bill to the bill introduced Friday in the Senate by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has rendered such an outstanding service to the Government and Federal civilian employees in developing the legislation which became S. 2162, providing a comprehensive governmentwide health benefits program for 2 million active Federal civilian employees.

My bill provides health coverage for career retired civil employees on the same basis that active employees and those who will retire after June 30, 1960, are covered in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which passed the Senate on July 16 by a vote of 81 to 4 and early this week was unanimously reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

### ANNUITANTS AND GOVERNMENT SHARE COSTS

This bill would provide health benefits coverage for approximately 260,000 retired Federal employees, Federal employees disabled while in service for the Government, and their spouses and minor children. The premiums under this bill are the same as provided for under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and are not to exceed \$3.80 per month for an annuitant who enrolls for himself only, and \$9.20 for an annuitant who enrolls for him-

self and members of his family. These premiums would be matched equally, on a 50-50 basis, by the Federal Government. The retired annuitant may have a free choice of plans: a service benefit plan, such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity plan, such as offered by the insurance industry; a group practice prepayment plan, such as offered by the Kaiser Foundation on the west coast and Group Health Association here in Washington, D.C.; and an employee organization plan, such as offered by national employee organizations.

### CONTRACTS, COVERAGE, ANNUITY DEDUCTIONS

Specific health benefits would be negotiated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, as the administering agency, with the various carriers. Annuitants would have 90 days after July 1, 1960, to elect coverage, and those who had not elected coverage within this period would lose the opportunity to do so. The annuitant's contribution, which would equal one-half of the cost, would be withheld by the Civil Service Commission from the annuity check.

### COSTS

Reliable figures as to the family composition of the presently retired annuitants of our Government are not readily available and, of course, the cost of such a program could not be ascertained until this information is studied by the Civil Service Commission. Another factor in determining costs would be the number of annuitants who might elect coverage under this voluntary health plan. However, reliable estimates place the first year's cost of health coverage for retired Federal civil employees at around \$40 million, which cost will be shared equally by the Federal Government and by the annuitant. The first year's cost will be the greatest since the presently retired and those who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is a group which inexorably will decline in size.

### PRIVATE INDUSTRY PROTECTS RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Federal Government cannot ignore the progressive examples of many large private employers who sponsor health benefits programs and have included in these programs persons already retired. These number, for example, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Eastman Kodak Co., Goodyear Tire Co., Firestone Tire Co., Gilmore Belt & Rubber Co., American Sugar Refining Co., Swift & Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and the First National Bank of Oregon.

If present retirees are not included in health benefits legislation on the same basis as future retirees will be included under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, large groups of retired employees may be penalized because they may lose such health insurance as they now have, or if they do not lose it, the premiums for continuing the insurance may be so greatly increased and become so high that it will be difficult for them to continue it. The reason for this is that many retirees are now insured in small local groups or under the



plan established by the National Association for Retired Civil Employees—NARCE—or other plans composed of active employees which allow them to continue such coverage after retirement. When the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 becomes effective on July 1, 1960, the presently active employees may promptly abandon these policies and seek coverage under the favorable terms of the new act. Without an influx of new members and newly retired members, the rates for these policies would become prohibitive, since the group would continue with only the presently retired, who, of course, become older each year.

It is my opinion that the need of older people in our area for voluntary health coverage has long been neglected. Providing health coverage for presently retired Federal employees would prove an important step forward in meeting the health needs of our older people. It is well known that the need for health services is extremely critical in older groups. We must not shut our eyes to this urgent need.

CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
RECOGNIZES NEED

Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in a letter to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER dated May 18, 1959, stated:

Anyone who expressed indifference to the plight of our already retired employees in being unable to obtain adequate health insurance at a price they can afford to pay would be callous indeed. \* \* \* To require retirees to assume all or a major portion of the cost would put the insurance out of their financial reach. The only possibility which suggests itself would be to consider already retired employees as a separate group from active employees and try to work out separate legislation for them.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
FAVORS

The report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on S. 2162 contains the following statement:

In making this recommendation, we have not overlooked the fact that the bill does not address itself to the problem of health insurance for those who are already retired, a fact that has given us much concern. We consider it essential that legislation for active employees and future retirees be supplemented in the near future by providing similar protection for those already retired. While we recognize the complexity of the problems involved in providing effective health benefit coverage to those already on annuities, the pressing health insurance needs of retired Federal employees suggest the importance of an early formulation of ways and means to meet their problems \* \* \*. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

NEW YORK PROVIDES HEALTH COVERAGE FOR ITS  
RETIRED STATE EMPLOYEES

The State of New York has wisely made health benefits coverage available to its retired State employees as of June 1, 1958, with the State paying 50 percent of the cost of the coverage for the retired employees. I am pleased also to report that our northern good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, has adopted a national hospitalization program which

includes its already retired senior citizens.

Health coverage for retired employees on a voluntary basis also has been endorsed by the insurance industry and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. I am also pleased to report that the Government Employees' Council of the AFL-CIO, representing over 600,000 Federal employees who are members of the AFL-CIO affiliated unions, have endorsed coverage for retired Federal civil employees.

As chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, it is my hope that health coverage for presently retired Federal civil employees and those who retire prior to July 1, 1960, will take effect on July 1, 1960, the same date when coverage begins for active and future retirees.

Legislation to provide voluntary health coverage to our career retired Federal civil employees is of vital importance and our Government, the Nation's largest employer, will be following in a pattern already established by progressive private industry and our most populous State, the State of New York.

White House Issues Text on Flag of the  
United States of America, Its Use and  
Background, Issued in Connection With  
Proclamation by President Eisenhower  
on Admission of Hawaii as the 50th  
State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a statement issued Friday, August 21, 1959, by the White House giving the background history of the flag of the United States of America. This official statement was issued in connection with the addition of the 50th star to the flag of the United States on the official admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This statement is so informative and pertinent to the development of the flag of the United States as the symbol of our beloved Nation now that two additional stars have been added to the blue background of our national emblem on account of the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States, respectively, that I am sure the within text, as issued by the White House will not only be of interest but of historical value to all Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all interested that they obtain copies of Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d

Congress. These, I am informed, may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE  
AND BACKGROUND

(Text of a statement issued by the White House giving background on the history of the flag. The statement was issued in connection with the addition of a 50th star to the flag on the admission of Hawaii as a State.)

THE NATIONAL FLAG

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag:

History of national flag

Before we became a Nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago, the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "An appeal to Heaven," was popular with our young navy. The rattlesnake's warning "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie liberty flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and Stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the Battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under the Grand Union Flag which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as Flag Day.

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular—with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another—is known as the Betsy Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that 2 stars and 2 stripes were added to the design—making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., September 13–14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.  
Alaska, January 3, 1959.  
Arizona, February 14, 1912.  
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.  
California, September 9, 1850.  
Colorado, August 1, 1876.  
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.  
Delaware, December 7, 1787.

Florida, March 3, 1845.  
Georgia, January 2, 1788.  
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.  
Idaho, July 3, 1890.  
Illinois, December 3, 1818.  
Indiana, December 11, 1816.  
Iowa, December 28, 1846.  
Kansas, January 29, 1861.  
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.  
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.  
Maine, March 15, 1820.  
Maryland, April 28, 1788.  
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.  
Michigan, January 26, 1837.  
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.  
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.  
Missouri, August 10, 1821.  
Montana, November 8, 1889.  
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.  
Nevada, October 31, 1864.  
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.  
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.  
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.  
New York, July 26, 1788.  
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.  
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.  
Ohio, March 1, 1803.  
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.  
Oregon, February 14, 1859.  
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.

Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.  
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.  
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.  
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.  
Texas, December 29, 1845.  
Utah, January 4, 1896.  
Vermont, March 4, 1791.  
Virginia, June 25, 1788.  
Washington, November 11, 1889.  
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.  
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.  
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

#### *Customs and usage as to flag of the United States*

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "The existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of mercy and grace, bowing at this noontide altar, we would subdue the day's noisy claims to silence as we listen for the divine voice which guides and blesses and reassures.

We would submit ourselves to the test of Thy white, scorching purity with which nothing unclean can live and to the rebuke of Thy absolute honesty in the searching scrutiny of which no refuge of lies can stand.

By the judgment of that purity and that honesty deliver us from the dangerous sophistries which afflict our day of elevating cleverness above goodness, and humor above honor.

Give us to know that our true life, our very effectiveness in the daily duty placed in our hands, depends always on the degree of the surrender, or failure to surrender, our self-centered inclinations to the final control of Thy will in which alone is our peace.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 24, 1959, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 24, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

S. 196. An act for the relief of Grover J. Cole;

S. 822. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain property administered as a part of the San Juan National Historic Site to the municipality of San Juan, P.R., in exchange for its development by the municipality in a manner that will enhance the historic site, and for other purposes;

S. 1330. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and Lee County, Fla.," approved July 22, 1958;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland;

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Kum Hung Seeto and Kum Wo Seeto;

S. 2099. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State;

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the acting President pro tempore laid before

the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2773. An act to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; and

H.R. 7373. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to certain veterans seriously disabled during a period of war.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8599) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 303. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1579. An act for the relief of Basile Ignatios Mavridis;

H.R. 1595. An act for the relief of Victor Hoffer;

H.R. 2078. An act for the relief of Gannon Boggs;

H.R. 2296. An act for the relief of the estate of Seth E. Libby, Jr.;